

Appendix A: Detailed AI Prompting of the Reply & Supportive Explanation

Dear Defendants, AUSA Romero, and lastly, if you choose to voluntarily review this, Chief Magistrate Judge Matthewman, and any other readers – This is the prompt I used to generate the Reply on the Temporary Injunction. This is not mandatory reading and could be ignored by the Chief Magistrate Judge in reviewing the Reply under the 10 page limit but it would surely be helpful for the Defendants to review as a government petitioning effort protected under the 1st Amendment rights to freely petition government and freely exercise religion. For further description of why I'm filing this into the case record and its significance, please see the post-script Introductory Letter afterward on pages 13-16.

AI Prompt for Reply to Defendants' Response on Preliminary and/or Temporary Injunction

I need to file a Reply to the Defendants' Response. You have a strict 10 page limit measured with 1.5 line spacing on 1" page margins on 8.5" x 11" paper using 12 point Times New Roman font.

- Argue that adding President Commander Donald Trump to this lawsuit is long overdue, as the last action, the Plaintiff's Reply, on the Second Amended Complaint with the included joinder request was filed over a month ago on September 22nd, 2025, and there has been no timely effort at a sur-reply by the Defendants. The decision on whether President Trump should be added to this lawsuit and whether the Second Amended Complaint should be allowed into the record is not just ripe but extremely overripe and further delay on that question is not in the interests of justice. The Plaintiff has been arguing that both Treasurer Beach and President Trump should be added to this lawsuit. For the record, the Plaintiff is also strongly tempted to include Secretary of State Rubio as well, in the context of US Passport production with the Sacred Name of G-D. This Court should rule on the addition of President Commander Trump to this lawsuit action before or at the same time as this requested injunction is decided and

issued. Section I from the Defendants is a pretty useless section on that front, and this particular injunction would nonetheless meaningfully survive even if Donald Trump were not joined to this lawsuit, as enjoining the Secretary of the Treasury who is superior to Treasurer Beach and is tasked with these now-controversial choices and exercises of authority should be enough to block these religiously problematic currency designs from here on. The Court obviously doesn't lack jurisdiction over Treasury Secretary Bessent, the first-named Plaintiff on this case, or any officers like Treasurer Brandon Beach inferior to him.

- The Defendants allege that the motto has no theological impact under Aronow v United States, but under the two Jewish religious sources that I cite, the Talmudic Tractate Rosh Hashanah 18B and Megillat Taanit on the Third of Tishrei, the motto clearly does have direct theological impact, and for this Court to say otherwise would be a very clear breach of fundamental religious freedom. As I've argued in the Second Amended Complaint, the doctrine of ceremonial deism doesn't hold any real water in Judaism, and is actually contrary to Jewish tradition which seeks to either secure the potency of G-D's Name or avoid its use in contexts where G-D's name is superfluous or should remain secular, as on currency, banknotes, and debt notes, as illustrated again by Tractate Rosh Hashanah 18B and Megillat Taanit RE: the ancient celebratory Third of Tishrei holiday when the people of Israel were weaned off the practice of superfluously printing the complete Holy and Sacred Name of G-D as the US Government is obstinately doing today. All these cases that the Defendants cite are tied to the Newdow-era Atheist claims. The Plaintiff is substantially burdened by these government practices, which most certainly do have a theological impact, and there is no alternative to cash in a large number of contexts and situations as the Plaintiff has repeatedly argued in the First and Second Amended Complaint. To find otherwise is willfully blind, and violates the legal precedent of American Council for the Blind v Paulson, which found that inability to use banknote cash was effectively a serious and very substantial burden on the blind, as it is even more so on me and any Jews like me who need to refrain from using cash and coin, in the sense that I can't even use American coins, which the blind and visually impaired actually can differentiate and unlike me can freely use.
- All these prior cases the Defendants cite are mostly irrelevant to this case, inasmuch as the Plaintiff and the adequately represented Jewish case for banknote and coin secularity and civigion (civic religion) over and instead of superfluous currency religion (sectarian invocation of the supernatural), and particularly the impermissible use of the

sacred Name of G-D superfluously on currency and passports) has never been adequately represented without ethical conflict to my knowledge by anyone, ever, anywhere in the United States aside from possibly Teddy Roosevelt, if he was privately aware of the underlying Jewish theological support for his No Motto coin effort. There are other countries that are serious about protecting the Name of G-d, like Muslim countries who I believe may have a similar kind of resonant faith on the Name of G-D, and there are an overwhelming, crushing number of countries that take currency secularity seriously. Only the United States and Nicaragua are outliers in using the Name of G-D superfluously on currency. And the inclusion of the motto on currency as I've seen I've pled for the last 11 years in correspondence to my previous lawyer, Mike Newdow, does clearly "increase the burden on practicing [my religion]".

- My claim is bursting with merit and the Defendants' opposition is baseless, like the US Attorney's and President Commander's absolutely horribly unconstitutional opposition to birthright citizenship in total violation and in total disrespect of the foundational 14th Amendment. As such, this and other US Attorneys should not be taken as any credible legal authority on what lawsuits have merit and which are well-based or baseless. The Plaintiff is very likely to succeed on the merits, particularly with the burdens documented in the Second Amended Complaint and the many years of correspondence revealing many (but by no means all) of the burdens Plaintiff faced as they were encountered disclosed in the Appendices of the Sur-reply to the Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint.
- The Plaintiff's harm is actual and imminent, not speculative. The design that's most emblematic of the Quarmillennial has already been selected by the Secretary of the Treasury, who publicly committed to exercise his authority under Secretary Bessent's warped interpretation of enabling law. This is evident in a X post that was posted at 4:05 PM on October 6, 2025, just a few hours after I filed my Motion for Preliminary Injunction, clarifying even further that the portrait has been "selected" under the meaning of the relevant statutes on permissible design selection. In that X post, on the Treasury Department's official X account, the Treasury Department said "@SecScottBessent is honored to exercise the authorities granted to him by Congress via the Circulating Collectible Coin Redesign Act of 2020 to issue coinage "with designs emblematic of the United States semiquincentennial" reflecting @POTUS and his vision for America." On this momentous anniversary, there is no profile more emblematic for the front of this coin than that of our serving President, Donald J. Trump. " This makes it super-clear in any

plain, ordinary reading of this post that the portrait or profile of Donald Trump, a living President not yet dead for two years, has been "selected" as a final choice for a Quarmillennial \$1 Trump Coin. If that's not the meaning of the Treasury Department's post, why is the Department "salami-slicing" and promoting this selection of the most emblematic profile for the front of the coin? And under statute, the selection of In G-D We Trust as a motto on this illegal coin is preordained and guaranteed unless this Court issues an immediate Preliminary Injunction and timely intervenes until final adjudication of this case. So even if the Defendants can find some way of convincing this Court to be naive about the finality of the Donald Trump portrait or profile selection, there's no way to raise any unreasonable doubt that the In G-D We Trust motto has been finally selected for this and any other upcoming coins or banknotes, per statute and official policy of the Department of Treasury. We don't have to wait for a final draft with final tweaks to be produced of Trump's exact preferred chin appearance to make a judgment that the final selection of Trump's profile, in any last-minute revised final finished form, has already been selected by final agency action as expressed in this October 6, 2025 Treasury Department worldwide-communicated post and is against the law, as argued in the Motion. The only reason it is "not clear this coin will be minted" is because it is so patently illegal for the Treasury to make this selection of Trump's profile for the front (and/or back, or any side, or any surface) of this coin. Informed citizens and journalists writing on the subject of this coin are flabbergasted and astonished by it and expressing immediate, severe doubt like me that this politically and I argue religiously idolatrous monarchically-influenced undemocratic Trump profile design can get past judicial review in Courts like yours. If you in this Court doesn't stop it though, it will be minted, as the Treasury Department has committed to exercising its authorities to get this selected design or something very similar to it, maybe with a just a chinlift adjustment for President Commander Trump, done. This selection is not speculation; it has been effectively completed with very overt public commitment and a committed exercise of authority to such a Trump profile design. At this point, there's no knowing how far the Trump administration will go to mint this design before there will be another opportunity to stop it. The Trump administration recently demolished the entire East Wing of the White House without even going through preliminary architectural design review of the National Capitol Planning Commission (NCPC). Likewise, there's no reason to trust that the Treasury Department will scrupulously announce and broadcast any further step to further formalize its final final final design selection of this coin until it's already very deep

into production and already delivering proofs to the White House for circulation and display. All that's highly illegal under statute against minting living Presidents and needs to be stopped now, at this design selection stage, before such a coin gets into the hands of the President Commander, before he can take enduring photographs or circulate media of himself or other agents or officers with such coin design specimens with the official imprint of the Treasury (US Mint or US Bureau of Engraving and Printing) in their hands. That's also true very broadly, imminently, and actually of any further entrenchment of In G-D We Trust banknotes and coinage until the Government settles this case with me in the Courts or by settlement agreement, if the Court actually forces the Government in granting this injunction to actually get serious about handling at least the core aspects of my complaint and taking my religious beliefs and those of others like me very seriously for once, rather than opposing endlessly and recklessly, with all the costs of delay that causes, especially as we breach past the once-every-250-years design momenta for the quarter-millennial.

- This injunction is meant to cover not just the Quatermillenial coinage but all new designs and coinage issued by the Treasury Department from this point forward. I'm suffering immediate harm from the ongoing re-entrenchment of In G-D We Trust into the currency system, in the way that it continues excluding me from commerce and calmunity (community) and in the way that it dissuades me from engaging in currency collection, inasmuch as it just encourages and blesses this ongoing design practice of printing In G-D We Trust on circulating and not just collectible coins, and inasmuch as this design directly violates for me my sincere, critical assumed duties as a minister of American Civigion (civic religion) that I conduct under the aegis of seeking Precedential (eg Presidential) office (in addition to my registration as a federal Precedential (Presidential) candidate, my civic religious efforts are also formally currently legally organized under my civic religious minister clergy status through the Universal Life Church). I have a duty to push for a separation of church and synagogue from state, and also a duty to push for the adoption of a pluralistic civic religion, and I take those responsibilities very seriously, and this proposed \$1 Trump Coin and all other coin and banknote designs selected from here on out that reentrench In G-D We Trust or any other invocation of any of the Divine and Sacred Name of G-D, or any other gods anyone sincerely believes in, onto our banknotes and coinage violates and interferes with my duties as I work to minister together a diverse and pluralistic model of civic religion consistent with the enduring American faith systems.

- The Defendants' are using a terribly obtuse strawman argument in saying that I'm demanding an immediate stop to all currency printing and minting. I'm very aware and cognizant that such an immediate "stop all the presses" action could cause substantial chaos in the US monetary system. I'm a responsible person running for the Presidency; I'm not the sort to issue an immediate stop order to all US Bureau of Engraving and Printing and US Mint operations – I don't want a full repeat of India's experience in the chaotic 2016 demonetization of ₹500 and ₹1000 banknotes. We don't need to repeat India's mistakes. While I do want the United States to demonetize all former "In G-D We Trust" US currency eventually, via cavigious trade-in, demonetization has to happen very, very slowly to be effective and minimally disruptive, slower than the Apollo launch timeframe I suggested earlier for the full stop of "oversacred currency" printing-and-minting, and I appreciate that currency collectors might hate me for demonetizing old In G-D We Trust currency over a further decade or two, for forcing collectors to irreversibly choose between redeeming their collection for face value or retaining their collection for the collectible or sentimental or spot price precious metal value of their currency. But the US Attorney is acting like I'll throw a huge mechanical wrench in the Treasury Department's printing and minting machines the day this preliminary injunction is instituted, putting the BEP and Mint staff on furlough. That's not what I seek. I'm reluctantly and resignedly ok with the Mint and BEP continuing to mint and print previously fully approved and enacted common circulating designs like all existing commonly used circulating coinage and banknotes. It is clear in the preliminary injunction that I am not with this preliminary injunction "impos[ing] on the Government's ability to continue to produce and circulate currency" for existing enacted already-circulating designs as of the date of the preliminary injunction's filing, October 6, 2025. I'm not a zealot, I'm a reasonable person with an appreciation for systems complexity, and I'm someone Treasury Secretary Bessent can work with while this gets unraveled. I'm painfully aware that a change that's too sudden on this can cost significant quantities of life. In the United States, the 2025 HHS value of a statistical life is approximately \$13.6 million. I don't want the Treasury Department to recklessly waste more national wealth than necessary to effectuate this change on an extreme emergency basis when some such transition costs can instead be devoted to lifesaving health and human services if we proceed through this transition more gently and steadily rather than violently, suddenly, and expensively. But I want this preliminary injunction to block all new or further design approvals and mechanical enactments and

printing/minting industrializations and further entrenchments immediately, and ideally also stop immediately all collectible "In G-D We Trust" non-necessary minting and printing that's not actually necessary for worldwide and national daily commerce. The world will not stop spinning if this Court suspends gold and silver In G-D We Trust coin production and sale until the Treasury can switch to No Motto or Different Motto versions of such collectible coinage. Any loss of income on seigniorage is very speculative and could be overwhelmingly reversed if the Government takes my suggestion to do a deep redesign of our currency, which I anticipate somewhat naively would spark a wave of currency collection and seigniorage that's not been seen in the United States for the last hundred years. Also note that while it's true I don't have as much of a religious problem with collectors who are serious about caring for and protecting expensive collectible currency samples, even oversacred collectible currency gets abused frequently, and as a Precedential (Presidential) Candidate and minister of American Civigion I really must push for an actual separation of synagogue and state, not just one that only stops the less-appreciated commonly circulating currency leaving collector currency oversacredly inscribed. As a religious Jew narrowly in a theostate, that might be ok and even laudable, but not as a civigious American.

- The United States BEP can continue printing up to 96,000,000 \$1 bills per month and other banknotes and coins with the Name of G-D for up to the length of time it took for JFK Jr. to launch the Apollo missions to the moon. But when that generous amount of time expires for a transition to less overly sacred designs, I expect there to be ro (e.g. zero) further coins or banknotes or passports minted or printed with the Name of G-D, under very extreme Court civil or even criminal contempt penalty if that is not obeyed exactly on time to meet for once the evident needs of the blind, visually impaired, Americans, Jews, and other minority religious and nonreligious beliefs. It would be impractical for the Treasury Department to wait until the last minute or last year to make the transition. I anticipate that the work of transition will be spread out as evenly, steadily, and gently as possible, with consistent effort after an initial planning and adaptation period. It boggles my mind and I posit any reasonable member of Congress' or citizen's mind to think that this would take more time to accomplish than an Apollo mission period of 8 years, 1 month, and 25 days, which I'm increasingly thinking should be started from either the date I filed this case (aggressive) or more correctly and patiently the entry date of any favorable preliminary injunction by this Court that sparks widespread national awareness and Congressional and Treasury Department seriousness of the "more likely

"than not" need for this adjustment and overhaul of our currency. I don't believe the Courts should cut the Treasury slack by dating this Apollo Mission from the date of a final ruling by the Supreme Court; that would just teach and instruct the Government to be callously indifferent and satisfied in being maximally molasses slow and unadaptive to an emerging clear and convincing civigious and religious need.

- Nothing I'm petitioning for in this preliminary injunction would cause a "mass disruption in the government's ability to produce and circulate currency". If the Government takes a cue from me on deep rather than shallow currency design, it would have "massive repercussions to the public", as that's the whole damned point of renaming and retitling our currency and its denominations and changing its design more deeply rather than shallowly. That's something we should all hope for. But this preliminary injunction itself won't have massive repercussions on the public, other than in sparking a much-needed and overdue public debate about the purposes of our currency and what designs we most wish to mint or print that are "most emblematic" of the quarter-millennial and our shared, pluralistic American civic religion and symbols. I believe every competent adult in the United States is capable of dreaming up a design for a new, different motto of the United States that is calmpetitive (competitive) with our current motto in unifying and aiming this country and our allies and enemies in the direction of our values, and believe it or not, some suggested designs will exceed by a enormous degree our existing "In G-D We Trust" motto, which was originally dreamed up, influenced, and selected seemingly by a junta of just three or four very politically ambitious evangelically focused men, without the input of a very broad, deep, and diverse calmunity (community) of voices and calmpeating (competing) designs. My own suggested designs for the motto replacement, from "In G We Trust" to the pro-universal-democracy mottos I previously proposed, I trust can be upbeat in some fashion or another by a clever 9th Grader in Kansas or a customer service rep in Washington. It's insanely vain and arrogant for the government to insist that it found the best, domestically and internationally perfect motto that could ever exist in the waning days of the Civil War in "In G-D We Trust", before non-prisoner American slaves were freed and women like the Assistant US Attorney could vocally vote and help tell Congress what the national motto should say and secure. So many of us were under gag order, de jure or de facto, when this motto was first selected, before its entrenchment could come under close stringent RFRA scrutiny.
- The public interest, American civigion, and the Jewish religion favors a separation of synagogue and state as well as nonidolatrous democratically-unprejudicing currency

patterns that conform to the law against the deification of living Presidents, who have all without exception been flawed, violent, imperfect men whom a significant portion of the contemporaneous population have hated. It is in the public interest to enjoin the Government from further entrenching the In G-d We Trust motto pending the final adjudication of this case, and it is in the public interest to cut the Treasury Department off at the knees before it actually produces any of these front-face Trump-profiled coins, if by some miracle the Treasury hasn't raced to produce them in official specimen form already and handed samples over to President Commander Trump in violation of counter-idolizing law implemented since Spencer M. Clark's Adonic impulses were firmly countermanded by Congress in 1866.

- If the Defendants wish to further brief the Court in sur-reply, it would be interesting to see if they can state for the record, definitively, that no physical samples or plaster or digital 3D models of this selected design or variations of Trump's profile on the front face of the \$1 Quatermilennial Coin have been worked on, made, or minted by anyone under the employ of the Treasury Department. The Plaintiff doubts that the Defendants haven't started or been racing with further digital and physical media to get Trump's profile onto the front of this proposed coin in very material ways, devoting significant Treasury Department labor and talent to this project instead of to actually objectively judicially acceptable quarter-millennial designs. Any hours devoted to adoringly depicting Trump's profile or face, especially on any physical media from plaster to metal by any artisan employed by Treasury, counts as a further abundantly clear violation of law, and that should be firmly enjoined, as should any reduction of the Sacred Name of G-D to any non-digital medium at Treasury onto plaster, metal, polymer, or cotton/linen outside of pre-existing designs in circulation and in production until this Court case is fully and finally decided.
- Plaintiff recognizes that this case may not be very politically comfortable for you, Honorable Chief Magistrate Judge Matthewman, as a Judge. It requires that you go out on a limb. One of the last times that happened, when a panel of judges ruled in favor of Mike Newdow eliminating the Name of G-D from the Pledge of Allegiance, led to those judges being publicly excoriated and all but ostracized by the religious legal community, and they were eventually overruled, typical of the Judicial Branch's historical diminishment and disrespect for any atheist claims, which I frankly personally consider as having more rightful legitimacy under the separation and secularity civigious (civic religious) principle than the Courts have granted to atheist plaintiffs. I know and

recognize that if you rule in my favor, in the favor of a civicious American and a religious Jew, it will probably inspire a significant degree of political outcry and controversy, and there are many religious people in the United States who will decry your action ruling in my favor. The Plaintiff expects many preachers and priests, and even possibly some prominent Jewish rabbis, will line up against any judicial injunction or ruling in my favor. But there will be many who come to your support in pushing for our country to be more civicious, civically religious, without tipping in violation of the separation of synagogue and state into the direction of over-sanctification of our currency system. But whatever popular opinion may be, even if it provokes widespread outrage, this injunctive action must still be ordered and done. Ruling in my favor on this preliminary injunction is the only directional choice that's actually consistent with the Constitution and RFRA statute – all other choices embroil and entangle the United States in an ongoing religious morass that excludes me, a born-and-bred American, and others like me from the American currency system and our only national legal tender for which there is no effective or adequate substitute. One of your most important jobs as a Judge in the Judicial Branch is to make pivotal decisions that protect minority interests, sometimes even a small minority, over the inconsiderate impulses of the majoritarian Congressional majority that, for instance, improperly I argue overruled Theodore Roosevelt's efforts to kill or modify the In G-D We Trust currency motto in 1907. Today, especially under RFRA, let alone the other constitutional provisions I've cited (1st, 5th, 8th, 14th), the case for ruling on this preliminary injunction in my favor is very clear and convincing.

- Quite separately, in a footnote, the Plaintiff does not have the resources or time to file another lawsuit with such and similar obstinate opposition from the US Attorney to bring the Secretary of State into compliance with civicious (civic religious) and American Jewish needs on passports, especially with respect to airport bathroom carry. The Plaintiff would like to also join the Secretary of State Marco Rubio to this lawsuit over the use of the complete sacred Name of G-D on US Passport designs, which I'm obligated to carry, transport, and protect weeks or even months at a time while traveling, through many calls of nature that take me and my US passport into and through defiling bathrooms. The method of destruction of passports is believed to be shredding as well, which is also, as with currency, deeply problematic. The complete Name of G-D ought to be buried instead.
- Finally, the Defendants have vexatiously been continuing to drumbeat against me in trying to get me and my claims marginalized and dismissed as a vexatious litigant. They

cite a mix of documents I've filed to say that I've been vexatious. I would point out that they've been exceptionally vexatious enough to raise this baseless vexatious litigant claim in all the following documents: <List all repetitions of vexatious litigant in all case documents it's appeared so far in the docket>. Is it really necessary for the US Attorney to continue beating that noxious drum? Can the Court instruct or admonish the US Attorney to stop claiming vexatiousness at every turn in every filing it makes, until I or other similar Plaintiffs hit X dismissed with prejudice unsuccessful cases? This constant attack is not a fair way of marginalizing the claims of a religious minority (and I believe a cavigious majority). I've been pursuing civil litigation to fight for matters that I'm cavigiously and religiously obligated to fight for, like kidney and liver donation incentives, age limits to the Commander-in-Chief role (eg Precedency and Presidency), a State of the Constitution address, and here civic religious but not overly sacred currency and passports. I've not always been right about legal precedent, as I surprisingly found I was wrong about the accepted current proper protocols for advising the Supreme Court on the introduction of an Annual State of the Constitution Address. But I've been doing my genuine best, and expending a tremendous amount of effort to conform to Court requirements and standards, to a level that this Court probably doesn't appreciate, having gone through your growing pains long ago in a gentler curriculum back in law school rather than through the school of sometimes very hard knocks on strict deadlines I've been facing over the years since I first needed some skilled legal help on Title IX equality back in 2011 and couldn't find anyone willing and ready to jump in and help. So I adapted, and slowly became better at legal argument and procedure, helped especially now with the advent of affordable and effective artificial intelligence. This is what citizens, residents, and visitors to the United States (aka Lifesaver Labs USA) are supposed to do: in our democracy, we're supposed to celebrate and support citizens who dedicate time to fixing injustice, fighting for life, and standing for what they believe, not label them and their attempted claims as vexatious and describe their efforts as a waste of Court and US Attorney resources. Would the Government rather I cut the motto out of banknotes to safeguard the Name of G-D in front of the Miami Secret Service Office until I get arrested and charged for it? Or would it rather I sue in Court? The resources the Government is "wasting" come from its obstinacy and obstruction on this. If they just were willing to meet with me for an hour, which I have a hard time believing I didn't merit at the time that I first filed, or if they were just serious about reading and interpreting my claims so far neutrally rather than defaulting to trenchant oppositional adversarialism, I

could have abundantly shown to them, if they were being reasonable, that they need to yield to this set of civicious and religious claims and settle instead of wasting time litigating a case that they're inevitably going to lose at one level or another, as soon as I come before a Judge or Judges ready to overturn the status quo to protect rightful minority religious and civicious rights. I hope that will happen in this District Court, as I have faith, Judge Matthewman, that you're just such a Judge, but if not here in District Court then somewhere along the chain of appeals up to SCOTUS this will be decided or settle out in my favor. For anything else to happen, for the most fundamental parts of my case adjusting the sacredness and symbology of our currency to be dismissed or overruled, violates my fundamental faith in the American civigion and the United States calmunity (the country I'd personally prefer to call and for Congress and the States to retitle after July 4, 2026 Lifesaver Labs United, i.e. "L²U", variantly aka Life and Liberty University, or Love and Lifespan Underwriting). President Commander Trump is currently proud of having renamed and rebranded the Gulf of Mexico the Gulf of America. I argue that's small potatoes; he should immediately set his sights and cites higher and rename and retitle the currency and our country in honor of our Quartermillennial while fixing up this problem with the overly sacred motto "In G-D We Trust". If he doesn't, if I'm elected in 2028 or thereafter, I pledge I will, subject to matching or outcalmpeating Congressional initiative.

- No controls should be put in place "to limit Plaintiff's filings". I have already moderated my impulse to file additional systems-design motions except as necessary. Nothing that I've filed merits any controls on my filings.

Post-Script Introductory Letter

For the legal or historical record, virtually everything from page 1 - 12 is the prompt that I submitted to Claude to begin drafting a Reply to the Preliminary Injunction. I didn't realize as I was drafting it in the claude.ai prompt window that it had grown to 12 pages at the required 1.5 line spacing. I'm including this as an Appendix to better illustrate my thinking for anyone who may need or want to review this argument more comprehensively, as much of this material ended up on the cutting room floor under space limit triage by Claude as we're laboring hard¹ to fit the 10 page limit in the Reply.

There are arguments and references here like the 2016 Indian Banknote demonetization, the foundation of civigion (civic religion), and more detail on the timeline I'm seeking for full resolution, among other things, that didn't get into the final 10 page limit.

Admittedly, there were some divergent digressions as well that I can understand were cut from the legal pleading by Anthropic PBC's Claude AI Sonnet 4.5 model but are relevant to calmunicate (e.g. communicate) to the Defendants, like the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to set our sights and cites higher and rename the "United States of America" (USA) to an even more morally powerful mission-focused name².

¹ I hope this transformation from raw drafted argument to AI-assisted legal pleading further helps buttress my ongoing argument with the Courts that all those detained (13th Amendment-exempted slaves), including myself if detained again, should be regularly granted access to artificial intelligence drafting and research interfaces to assist them in their legal defense under the right to defense counsel guaranteed (by a fellow *pro se* filer!) in Gideon v Wainwright. I'll be able to point any judge at a Bail Hearing to this case and this appendix and the AI-assisted Reply filing transformation as an example of the legal drafting support and refinement we're each being denied if detained again without such regular access to intelligence.

² The L²U vs USA Country Quarter-millennial Renaming Proposal

- 1A) Lifesaver Labs USA / United (vs static United States of America)
- 1B) Love and Liberty University (vs static United States of America)
- 1C) Liberty and Lifespan Underwriting (vs static United States of America)
- 1D) All of the above baked in, referenced with one stroke as L²U (vs static, traditional United States of America / USA)

and all further permutations, etc. with L²U also acting as a beautiful backronym like CALM, and it even has the added side effect of accelerating calmunity youth education on exponentiation

Like I say below, renaming the Gulf of America was small potatoes and a quick warm-up by comparison to renaming our motto, our currency units (small and large), or our country in encouraging a rethinking of our currency more freely from root to tip as this injunction decision and the quatermillennial approaches. I must freely admit suggesting a quarter-millennial change of name for our Nation is a bit "off-road" from the mechanics of what I have a strict Constitutional and RFRA religious legal claim of enforcement over, and I can understand why Claude cut it from the 10 page legal filing on currency sacredness reform under my more narrow immediate legal demand rights which are delimited just to the Sacred Motto, but it's certainly part of the overall package of the bold currency reform and design I'm suggesting is advisable with the suspension or end of the In G-D We Trust oversacred motto and the Court-enforced halt on newly selected currency designs until this case settles or is fully adjudicated and design specifications are civigiously (civically religiously) rethought consistent with these legal claims without the excessively-sacred In G-D We Trust motto.

Please forgive me, Judge Matthewman, for including this in the case record. While I know it's atypical to appendix something like this, I really feel it's very obviously worth sharing with and petitioning for review the Defendants with influence over the Quatermillennial Currency Reform and Quatermillennial Celebrations as we approach this once-in-a-lifetime Quatermillennial³, and

(Love *multiplies* Liberty / Liberty *multiplies* Lifespan). Very open to any better ideas if better options can be dreamed up calmpetitionally.

³ *It would certainly help Secretary Bessent, Treasurer Beach, and President Commander Donald Trump get permanently into the highest-impact service and history/herstory books. And I repeat, as I do below, that if the Defendants don't take action on proposing a rename to our Country, I pledge I will do my utmost to in the future assuming I can gain enough mutual influence and conscience (literally: science done conscientiously, together) with Congress and the ratifying States to amend our country's Name in the Constitution collaboratively. I'm not convinced that the best name for our country in 1776 is the best name for our country 250 years later in 2026 for the next 250 years driving us and our posterity toward the year 2276. Renaming our country can help secure our Nation's mission; finding and proposing a more "directive" name is a must for me. I'll share that just like Donald Trump takes the art of artful branding as part of his core identity and mission, this pervasive focus on Sapir-Whorf naming you're seeing suffusing this case is part of my perceived and assumed RFRA religious duties under religious freedom under the creation myth or story of אָדָם (American translation: Adam), my standing Hebrew name, as אָדָם reportedly biblically named all the animals, and in naming the animals imbued them with a behavioral imprint / souls. For me, ever since my Hebrew name changed to אָדָם, it's a very natural, customary, common behavior to propose renaming places and things to inspire, revive, and redrive, even when they're enormous, highly-inertial, difficult-to-change systems like the Rosh Hashanah Tractate-problematic In G-D We Trust motto or the name of dollars (→ CALM?), cents (→ points?), and the USA (→ L²U?), at least whenever the switching costs are lower than perceived renaming outcomes. Only the Name of the USA requires constitutional*

I don't know of any other way to effectively petition government on these more detailed aspects of the Reply on this extremely massive operation suggested.

While I could and may be wrong, it could possibly be that this prelim injunction draft reply prompt becomes historically interesting or useful to have documented for review, as this unrefined prompt is in some ways closer to my original, complete voice and thinking.

I recognize that filing this may invite the Assistant US Attorney to push again for some prefilling restrictions on my speech, but I argue that since this is included in an Appendix and not the main body of my 10 page limited argument, such restrictions would be unconstitutional, an undue and improper abridgment of my ability to petition government freely under the 1st Amendment with the depth of creative thought that this set of topics deserve.

Lastly, a special note, I deeply regret that the US Attorney's Office, to the best of my knowledge, is going and working unpaid at the present time. Her latest Response filing was probably undertaken without pay or on imperfectly guaranteed deferred pay. It is probably a source of resentment that she's being forced to review or pass forward for review "unnecessary" creative argument and proposals during a government shutdown when she insists on paper at least that she doesn't believe I have a strong case of sincere beliefs and substantial burdens. I'm sympathetic and empathetic and I want her to be repaid and paid with a return to regular order. If this case were less time-sensitive, I'd consider proposing suspending the case until the shutdown closes. The problem though with suspending this case during the shutdown is that every day millions of banknotes are shredded by the Federal Reserve destroying the Name of G-d, which is a direct ongoing religious violation we need to start speeding forward a phaseout of, and also we only have 250 days until the Quartermillennial, and every day remaining counts ginormously in determining the range of options for the Precedency, the America250 Commission, the Congress, and the Treasury Department that properly and timely strike the mark of July 4, 02026. Calendar time doesn't stop. As much as I hate asking her and the other Defendants' to review such while they may be going unpaid, this requested injunction and the national redesign space it opens must be put into timely motion or the public design process of Motto Replacement, Currency Reform, and National Renaming relevant to the currency design ("Dollars?", "Cents?", "United States of America?", "Dead Presidents?") will suffer. While I feel

amendment with a final step of state ratification or general or limited-purpose constitutional convention; the rest are statutory and controlled by Congress alone.

terrible about it, if I were in power, I would classify all critical work connected to the Quarter-Millennial as time-sensitive and essential.

Subsequent to and aligned with this injunction, if the Government starts working shortly after the shutdown on deliberating over not just the potential quartermillennial replacement to *In G-D We Trust* but also currency name change and a name change for our country established by constitutional amendment to be imprinted on our Quatermillennial Celebration Currency in the fist mints and prints of the "No Motto" or "Different Motto" post-overshot sacred *In G-D We Trust* Currency, there's still enough time to work through ratification by 38 states or a limited-purpose constitutional convention, but time is short compared to historical review times by State Legislatures and a faster limited-purpose constitutional convention is as yet unprecedented.

None of this introduction or the prompt below was AI assisted, except for a bit of old English (2025) spell-checking. This writing my sense of cautious hope for our currency and everything it encodes and suggests about our mission with each other when we trans-act over actions small, large, and monumental and reflects my spirit and soul on this better I'd say than the AI-condensed 10 page limited Reply filing.

If I don't lose and instead prevail on this preliminary injunction and currency redesign conversation starts, this prompt below will become more legally, politically, historically, and archivally meaningful in pushing the government for doing more than the most minimally necessary design change.

I pray this government leverages Trump's extraordinary branding skill to rebrand the United States of America as you're presented with this very unique, once-in-a-lifetime currency and calmunity redesign opportunity in the next 250 days leading up to the 250th Anniversary of the USA, aka I suggest LU, the Nation of Lifesaver Labs USA, Love and Liberty University, and Love and Lifespan Underwriting.